BRENTWOOD MIDDLE 2685 Leeds Avenue North Charleston, South Carolina 29405 6-8 Middle School GRADES ENROLLMENT 908 Students Wanda Marshall 843-745-7094 PRINCIPAL SUPERINTENDENT Dr. Maria Goodloe 843-937-6319 BOARD CHAIR Mr. Gregg Meyers 843-720-8714 THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ANNUAL SCHOOL 2003 REPORT CARD ABSOLUTE RATING: UNSATISFACTORY Absolute Ratings of Middle Schools with Students like Ours Excellent Good Average Below Average Unsatisfactory U 0 17 14 IMPROVEMENT RATING: UNSATISFACTORY ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: ND This school met 11 out of 21 objectives. The objectives included performance and participation of students in various groups and student attendance rate. SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country. FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT WEBSITES AT: WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM WWW.SCEOC.ORG

PERFORMANCE T	RENDS OVER	4-YEAR F	FRICO

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	N/A
2002	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	N/A
2003 2004	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	No

PALMETTO ACHIEVEMENT CHALLENGE TESTS (PACT) RESULTS

Our School Middle Schools with Students like Ours







Mathematics

English/Language Arts

Mathematics

English/Language Arts



Very high score; very well prepared to work at next grade level; exceeded expectations



Well prepared to work at next grade level; met expectations



Met standards; minimally prepared, can go to next grade level



Did not meet standards; must have an academic assistance plan; the local board policy determines progress to the next grade level

NOTE: Science and social studies are to be included in the 2005 school report card.

Definition of Critical Terms

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS

	Teachers	Students	Parents
Number of surveys returned	57	222	84
Percent satisfied with learning environment	16.7%	48.2%	48.2%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	23.2%	47.0%	50.0%
Percent satisfied with home-school relations	7.1%	75.5%	38.6%

PACT PERFORMANC	E BY GRO							7.
		ent let ind	/.	ole State		Proficient of	Advanced on Profi	cientand cientand
	in	eli (esti)	lested old	CM Byg.	Basic oh	roficie	Hand &	cient and
	EMOIL	40, 04	% / \%	30 /0	0/0	0/0	Mr. JOHO	May
	/ • •	/	90	milah/Lar	iguage Ai		/ 6/6	/ ,
All students	811	97.8	68.8	25.9	5.1	0.1	5.3	17.6
Gender	011	0110	00.0	2010	011	0.1	0.0	1110
Male	426	96.9	74.9	22.0	2.8	0.3	3.1	17.6
Female	385	98.7	62.2	30.2	7.7	N/A	7.7	17.6
Racial/Ethnic Group								
White	50	96.0	40.5	33.3	26.2	N/A	26.2	17.6
African-American	744	97.8	71.3	25.3	3.2	0.2	3.4	17.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6
Hispanic	12	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6
Disability Status								
Not disabled	626	99.2	65.5	27.9	6.5	0.2	6.6	17.6
Disabled	185	93.0	81.9	18.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6
Migrant Status								
Migrant	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6
Non-migrant	811	97.8	68.7	26.0	5.2	0.1	5.3	17.6
English Proficiency		100						
Limited English proficient	5	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.6
Non-limited English proficient	806	97.8	68.7	26.1	5.0	0.1	5.2	17.6
Socio-Economic Status								
Subsidized meals	679	98.2	69.6	25.7	4.7	N/A	4.7	17.6
Full-pay meals	131	95.4	64.8	27.0	7.4	8.0	8.2	17.6
				Matho	matics			
All students	811	98.5	68.0	26.6	4.5	0.9	5.4	15.5
Gender	011	30.3	00.0	20.0	4.5	0.5	5.4	13.3
Male	426	97.9	70.2	25.0	3.9	0.8	4.8	15.5
Female	385	99.2	65.4	28.4	5.2	0.9	6.1	15.5
Racial/Ethnic Group	303	99.Z	00.4	20.4	J.Z	0.9	0.1	10.0
White	50	100.0	39.5	39.5	18.6	2.3	20.9	15.5
African-American	744	98.4	70.3	25.8	3.2	0.6	3.8	15.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5
Hispanic	12	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5
Disability Status	(N//C)	0.0	. 47.3	. 1// 1	. 4/7 (. 47 (.,,,	10.0
Not disabled	626	99.5	63.9	29.5	5.7	0.9	6.6	15.5
Disabled	185	95.1	83.7	15.6	N/A	0.7	0.7	15.5
Migrant Status								
Migrant	N/A	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5
Non-migrant	811	98.5	67.9	26.7	4.5	0.9	5.4	15.5
English Proficiency								
Limited English proficient	5	100.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.5
Non-limited English proficient	806	98.5	67.8	26.8	4.6	0.7	5.3	15.5
Socio-Economic Status								
Subsidized meals	679	98.7	66.7	28.4	4.3	0.5	4.8	15.5
Oubolaizou illoulo								

PACT PERFORMANCE BY GRADE LEVEL

		Enroll	8404, 0/0	183 010 86	40 / o/	Ba 0/0	6/2	AC 0/0 Profit
		/ • •	7		/Langua	ge Arts		_ ===
$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2002	Grade 6	252	N/A	57.8	32.2	7.8	2.2	10.0
	Grade 7	274	N/A	60.5	36.8	2.7	N/A	2.7
	Grade 8	273	N/A	62.5	32.8	4.3	0.4	4.7
	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
83	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2003	Grade 6	276	99.3	75.1	19.5	5.4	N/A	5.4
	Grade 7	247	95.1	59.7	32.5	7.3	0.5	7.8
	Grade 8	288	98.6	70.8	26.1	3.2	N/A	3.2

				M	athematic	s		
	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2002	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	Grade 6	252	N/A	60.2	34.2	5.6	N/A	5.6
	Grade 7	274	N/A	76.2	22.2	1.1	0.4	1.5
•	Grade 8	273	N/A	70.5	27.6	2.0	N/A	2.0
	Grade 3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2003	Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	Grade 6	276	98.9	60.5	33.2	5.8	0.4	6.3
	Grade 7	247	97.2	64.3	27.1	6.8	1.9	8.7
	Grade 8	288	99.3	77.6	20.5	1.6	0.4	2.0

SCHOOL PROFILE

C	Our School	Change from Last Year	Middle Schools with Students Like Ours	Median Middle School
Students (n= 908)				
Students enrolled in high school credit courses (grades 7 & 8)	6.1%	Up from 6.0%	7.3%	14.4%
Retention rate	0.1%	Down from 10.7%	3.6%	2.3%
Attendance rate Eligible for gifted and talented	95.1%	Up from 91.4%	94.7%	95.2%
	1.2%	Down from 1.8%	5.7%	13.6%
On academic plans On academic probation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
With disabilities other than speech Older than usual for grade	23.2%	Up from 19.9%	16.4%	14.1%
	43.5%	Up from 16.5%	9.9%	4.9%
Suspended or expelled	1.4%	Up from 0.0%	1.6%	1.3%
Annual dropout rate	1.8%	Down from 2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Teachers (n= 56)				
Teachers with advanced degrees Continuing contract teachers	32.1%	Down from 39.2%	44.6%	47.1%
	53.6%	Down from 72.5%	70.7%	82.5%
Highly qualified teachers Teachers returning from previous year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	71.6%	Down from 79.6%	73.9%	84.3%
Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary	91.8%	Down from 93.3%	94.6%	95.0%
	\$35,575	Down 5.2%	\$38,478	\$39,924
Prof. development days/teacher	11.0 days	Down from 12.9 days	11.5 days	10.7 days
School				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	2.0	3.0
Student-teacher ratio	19.2 to 1	Down from 29.5 to 1	18.1 to 1	21.0 to 1
Prime instructional time	84.9%	Up from 83.1%	86.8%	88.9%
Dollars spent per pupil*	\$4,864	Up 13.1%	\$7,217	\$5,854
Percent spent on teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts	63.6%	Down from 70.1%	58.9%	62.0%
	Good	No change	Good	Good
Parents attending conferences SACS accreditation	72.4%	Up from 60.5%	86.3%	94.8%
	no	N/A	yes	yes

^{*} Prior year audited financial data are reported.

	Our District	State	
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools	N/A	N/A	
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools	N/A	N/A	

				-
Δhhra	wiati∧n	e tor i	Missina	I lata

		ū	
N/A Not Applicable	N/C Not Collected	N/R Not Reported	I/S Insufficient Sample

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

The 2002-2003 school year at Brentwood Middle School was a year filled with exciting changes. With additional administration support staff, our first full time school psychologist, and support from state department personnel, Brentwood continued on its path to success. In order to meet the needs of our Below Basic population, the instructional time in Math and Language Arts classes was extended. In addition, smaller class sizes were created.

During the second semester, we were fortunate enough to receive assistance from the National Education Association. The organization took Brentwood under its wing to provide financial and educational support. The NEA spent the latter part of the year getting to know the faculty, staff, students, parents, and community in an effort to identify the goals needed for success.

Working closely with the administration, teachers experienced ownership in the vision for Brentwood, and students were the first to see the benefits. Dynamic teachers exposed students to a variety of cultural and educational experiences that enhanced their academic classes. Field trips to art museums, aquariums, Biedler Forest, Avery Institute, Penn Center, etc. had Brentwood students learning valuable information to help prepare them for the future. Students had the opportunity to experience a "School Without Walls" this year. Math and Science Family Night had parents measuring, weighing, and calculating with their students. Other family and community activities included a Family Winter Formal, monthly PTSA Community meetings, a Soul Food Festival, Family Reading Night, a School Beautification Project, a Reading Club, and mentoring. All activities were assisted by volunteers.

Teachers used the SC State Curriculum Standards to develop assessments, pacing charts, lesson plans, and attended weekly planning sessions to share ideas and information. Teachers worked collaboratively with the district to enhance their working knowledge of the state standards. Through extensive benchmark testing, teachers were able to determine students' strengths and weaknesses and tailor their lessons to individual student needs. A daily PACT Workshop, PLATO, and NCS were implemented allowing students to receive additional, individualized instruction designed to prepare them for PACT. An after school program provided additional tutoring for students who scored below basic on last year's PACT. Several intervention programs were implemented to assist with academic performance and school climate.

We expect Brentwood to continue to increase its level of success, therefore improving student achievement and school climate.

Wanda L. Marshall, Principal

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.